

**REMARKS**

This is a full and complete response to the Office Action. Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the following remarks.<sup>1</sup>

**REGARDING THE CLAIMS:**

Claims 21, 22, 26, 28-31, 33-42 and 44-52 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-20, 23-25, 27, 32 and 43 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Amendments have been made to claims 21, 26, 28, 34, and 37. New claims 47-52 have been added. Applicant submits that the pending claims are in a state ready for allowance. No new matter has been added.

**REGARDING THE SPECIFICATION:**

The Office Action states that “the title of the invention is not descriptive” and that “[a] new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention.” *Office Action*, p. 3. Responsively, Applicant submits the following amended title:

SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PRIORITIZED COMMUNICATION BETWEEN A CENTRAL STATION  
AND REMOTE OBJECTS

Applicant has amended the title in order to expedite the examination of the present application and requests that the above amended title replace all prior versions of the title of this application.

---

<sup>1</sup> As Applicant’s remarks with respect to the Examiner’s rejections are sufficient to overcome these rejections, Applicant’s silence as to assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such rejections (e.g., assertions regarding dependent claims, whether a reference constitutes prior art, whether references are legally combinable for obviousness purposes) is not a concession by Applicant that such assertions are accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicant reserves the right to analyze and dispute such in the future.

**IN RESPONSE TO THE OFFICE ACTION:**

**DISPOSITION OF THE CLAIMS:**

The Office Action recites that “there are TWO separate and distinct inventive concepts” such that “claim 11 and 23 teach a car with cellular public/private transceiver and preemptive modes” while “claims 21, 28, 34 and 37 teach a car with public/private transceiver and having sleep/standby modes based on message reception.” *Office Action*, p. 2.

Applicant submits that in light of the cancellation of claims 11 and 23, and their dependent claims, and the amendments to claims claims 21, 28, 34 and 37, the Office Action assertion of two separate and distinct inventive concepts is remedied. Applicant submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests favorable action.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):**

The Office Action indicates that claims 11, 12, 15-18, 21-24 and 26-46 have been rejected. However the Examiner has not actually rejected all of these claims as the Office Action does not specifically address nor give a clear basis for the rejection of dependent claims 42-46. Applicant shall respond to the rejection of claims 11, 12, 15-18, 21-24 and 26-46 as completely as possible; however, given the limited explanation of the rejection, should the Examiner wish to maintain the rejection to claims 42-46, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner issue another non-final rejection explaining the basis for rejection in greater detail.

**Combination of Timm in view of Nojima, and Uhlik or Zdunek**

Claims 11, 12, 15-18, 23-24 and 27 of which claims 11 and 23 are independent claims, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Timm et al. (U.S. 5,572,204) (hereinafter “Timm”) in view of Nojima (U.S. 5,933,080) (hereinafter “Nojima”) and further in view of Uhlik et al. (U.S. 6,600,914) (hereinafter “Uhlik”) or Zdunek (U.S. 5,115,233) (hereinafter “Zdunek”).

In light of the cancelation of claims 11, 12, 15-18, 23-24 and 27, Applicant considers the rejection of claims 11, 12, 15-18, 23-24 and 27 moot. Additionally, after review of the rejections, Applicant reiterates its position asserted in the previous Response regarding the same in that the present Office Action also does not state a prima facie case of obviousness for the pre-amended version of the claims. To that end, Applicant expressly reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of the previous claims in future prosecution.

Combination of Timm in view of Nojima, Uhlik or Zdunek and further in view of Sato

Claims 21, 22, and 27-41, of which claims 21, 28, 34 and 37 are independent claims, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Timm et al. (U.S. 5,572,204) in view of Nojima (U.S. 5,933,080) and Uhlik (U.S. 6,600,914) or Zdunek (U.S. 5,115,233) and further in view of Sato (U.S. 5,953,677) (hereinafter “Sato”). Again, Applicant reiterates its position asserted in the previous Response regarding the same in that the present Office Action still does not state a prima facie case of obviousness for the pre-amended version of the claims and Applicant expressly reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of the previous claims in future prosecution.

Allowable Subject Matter:

The Office Action states that claims 19 and 25 are objected to, “but would be allowable if written in independent form.” *Office Action*, p. 14. The allowable subject matter of claim 25 has been included within amended independent claims 21, 28 and 34. As a result, independent claims 21, 28 and 34 are in condition for allowance. Furthermore, claim 37 has been amended with the allowable subject matter of claim 19. Therefore, independent claim 37 is also in condition for allowance.

Applicant submits that as a result of the amendments to independent claims 21, 28, 34 and 37, their rejection is rendered moot. Additionally, dependent claims 22, 26, 29-31, 33, 35-36, 38-42, and 44-46 are allowable based on their various dependencies on allowable independent claims 21, 28, 34 and 37, as well as for the additional features recited therein. Although Applicant has not argued the dependant claims here, Applicant reserves the right to do

so at a later time. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 21-22, 26, 28-31, 33-42 and 44-46 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**NEW CLAIMS:**

New claim 47 has been added to focus on at least one embodiment in which a single cellular phone module is utilized for communication between the central station and the remote object. (See paragraph [0033] of the original specification.) Claim 47 further recites that the selectable services subscription manages execution of a plurality of prioritized non-emergency service requests received at the remote object such that a priority non-emergency requested service is activated in the service execution mode. (See, for example, paragraphs [0027], [0041] and [0045] of the original specification.)

It is respectfully asserted that none of the art of record discloses the prioritized non-emergency service requests with the benefit being that a single cellular phone module may be economically utilized for communication between the central station and the remote object.

New claims 48 and 49 recite exemplary non-emergency service requests that are prioritized and which include a remote status information request, a malfunction information request, a diagnostics information request, a maintenance information request and a technical information request. Again, it is respectfully asserted that none of the art of record discloses the prioritization of such non-emergency service requests.

In view of the discussion above, Applicant submits that all pending claims are non-obvious over the references of record, and respectfully requests that all rejections be withdrawn and a Notice of Allowance issue with respect to the currently pending claims.

\*\*\*\*\*

In order to facilitate the resolution of any issues or questions presented by this paper, the Examiner is invited to directly contact the undersigned by phone to further the discussion.

The undersigned representative authorizes the Commissioner to charge any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or 1.17 that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 14-1437, referencing Attorney Docket No.: 7589.033.PCUS00.

Novak Druce + Quigg LLP  
1000 Louisiana, Fifty-Third Floor  
Houston, Texas 77002  
(713) 571-3400  
(713) 456-2836 (fax)  
[tracy.druce@novakdruce.com](mailto:tracy.druce@novakdruce.com)

Respectfully submitted,  
  
/Tracy W. Druce/  
  
Tracy W. Druce, Esq.  
Reg. No. 35,493